



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,635	07/16/2003	Myles Kimmitt	2333-US-C	1709
56436	7590	12/03/2007	EXAMINER	
3COM CORPORATION			MUI, GARY	
350 CAMPUS DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752-3064			2616	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/620,635	KIMMITT, MYLES
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gary Mui	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract filed on September 19, 2007 contains legal phraseology; for example on line 4 the legal phraseology used is "said". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buchanan et al.

Buchanan et al. disclose, regarding claim 1, a method for transporting data across a plurality of data channels comprising:

concurrently generating a plurality of lesser width parallel data words containing parallel data from a greater width parallel data word (see column 4, lines 54 – 56, 62 – 64) such that all adjacent bits of the greater width parallel data word are contained in different ones of the lesser width parallel data words (see column 5, lines 18 – 21, 60 – 64 wherein the output is in the order, 3-2-1-0 implies bit 3 comes from data stream DATAIN0, bit 2 comes from data stream DATAIN1, bit 1 comes from DATA stream DATAIN2, bit 0 comes from data stream DATAIN3, which correspond to adjacent bits of the greater width parallel data words are contained in different ones of the lesser width parallel data words) wherein the number of bits in the greater width parallel data word is greater than the number of bits in each of the lesser width parallel data words (see column 4, lines 55 – 56);

serializing parallel data representative of the plurality of lesser width parallel data words (see column 4, lines 62 – 64);

and transmitting the serialized data words over a corresponding plurality of distinct serial data channels (see column 5, lines 16 – 17).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al. in view of Nishida et al. (US 5978486).

Buchanan et al. disclose, regarding claim 2, all the subject matter of the claimed invention as recited in paragraph 7 of this office action.

Buchanan et al. fail to disclose scrambling the parallel data in the lesser width parallel data words to form a plurality of scrambled data words.

Nishida et al. from the same or similar field of endeavors teach scrambling the parallel data in the lesser width parallel data words to form a plurality of scrambled data words (see column 18, lines 33 – 36).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use scrambling the parallel data in the lesser width parallel data words to form a plurality of scrambled data words in the method taught by Buchanan et al. in order to allow easy clock recovery by averaging changes in amplitude, polarity, and phase of a transmitted signal (see column 1, lines 26 – 29).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed September 19, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the entire contents of the remarks, in particular that the Buchanan reference fails to teach "all adjacent bits of said greater width parallel data word are contained in different ones of said width parallel data words". The examiner respectfully disagrees. In the Buchanan reference it teaches the partitioning of a 16-bit parallel data stream to four groups of four bits (a nibble) streams (see column 4 line 54 – 56; the generation of lesser width parallel data words from a greater width parallel data word). The four groups are labeled DATAIN0, DATAIN1, DATAIN2, and DATAIN3 contains a nibble of the whole 16-bit parallel data (see column 5 line 19 – 21; adjacent bits of said greater parallel data word contained in different ones of said lesser width parallel words). The nibbles will then be serialized and transmitted on separate serial lines (see column 5 line 15 – 17). Therefore,

claim 1 is rejectable under the Buchanan reference. For claim 2, it is shown above that the Buchanan reference teaches the "all adjacent bits of said greater width parallel data word are contained in different ones of said width parallel data words" and thus claim 2 rejectable under Buchanan in view of Nishida.

### *Conclusion*

9. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular paragraphs or columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Mui whose telephone number is (571) 270-1420. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs. 9 - 3 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GM 11-28-2007

  
RICKY Q. NGO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER